

REMARKS

In response to the final office action, Applicant submits a proposed amendment to claim 1. This amendment further clarifies the subject matter of the invention and clearly distinguishes the claim from the cited art.

Usami

As the Examiner has pointed out, and as is apparent from FIG. 4 of *Usami*, the liner layer 17 becomes thinner towards the left-hand portion of the figure. This thinning of the layer 17 defines a groove. Although the liner layer does not disappear altogether, the Examiner appears to consider this thinning of the liner layer 17 to amount to an “interruption” of the liner layer. However, this thinning is at best only a “partial” interruption, or more accurately, a “constriction.”

Applicant submits that there is a great deal of difference between an “interruption” and a mere “constriction.” For example, if a lane on a bridge were closed, traffic would continue to flow, albeit more slowly. This would amount to a “constriction.” In contrast, if the bridge were to collapse altogether, no traffic at all would flow. This would amount to an “interruption.”

In an effort to draw attention to this distinction, Applicant amends the claim to recite “completely interrupting” the liner layer. Applicant submits that this proposed amendment clearly avoids the teaching of *Usami*.

Jeng

As best understood, the Examiner appears to consider the diamond layer 16, because it is an insulator, to correspond to the “liner” recited in claim 21.

Applicant amends the claim to include the step of selecting the liner layer to be made of a material having a dielectric constant that is greater than the dielectric constant of the intermediate dielectric. Support for this amendment can be found on page 5, lines 10-12 of the application.

Applicant : Detlef Weber
Serial No. : 09/898,909
Filed : July 3, 2001
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 12816-021001 / S1166 SB/flu

In *Jeng*, the material of the alleged "liner layer" 16 is selected on the basis of its thermal conductivity, and not on the relationship of its dielectric constant to the dielectric layer 30. In particular, *Jeng* teaches that:

"a highly thermally conductive material, such as diamond film 16 is applied to the surface of the wafer"¹

Accordingly, *Jeng* fails to teach or suggest the claimed method.

The foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance by overcoming the section 102 rejections of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests that they be entered.

No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket number "12816-021001."

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-9-03



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

¹ *Jeng*, col. 3, lines 44-46